

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-4 and 7-40 are pending in the application. Claims 1-4 and 7-40 stand rejected. Claims 1, 3, 26, 29, 31, 32, 34, 36, 38 and 40 are being amended. No new matter is being introduced by way of these amendments.

Part 1 of the Office Action acknowledges that Applicants have elected Group I without traverse. Applicants thank Examiner for entering the election of Group I without traverse.

Part 2 of the Office Action lists the status of each claim in the present application.

Part 3 of the Office Action states that the title of the invention is not descriptive. The title of the invention is "Method and Apparatus for Automatic Network Address Assignment." The preamble of Claim 1 recites "[a] method for automatically assigning a network address to a given network node ...." Similar descriptions are used in the other independent claim preambles. Accordingly, in view of the limitations in the independent claims, Applicants believe that the title of the invention is indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed and, therefore, respectfully request that the objection to the title be withdrawn. Should the Office feel otherwise, Applicants hereby request an Examiner's interview to discuss this objection.

In Part 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner has requested that Applicants state that the Substitute Specification, filed on December 12, 2005, does not contain new matter. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the Substitute Specification, as filed on December 12, 2005, does not contain new matter. Applicants thank Examiner for pointing out this inadvertent omission.

Part 5 of the Office Action requests Applicants proofread the specification for errors. Applicants, in preparation for the Amendments filed April 6, 2005 and October 20, 2005, reviewed entire application for typographical errors, accuracy, assurance of proper use for trademarks, and other legal symbols. Applicants believe that the amendments made to the specification in the previous Amendments and Substitute Specification reflect all changes needed to comply with the request. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the objection be withdrawn. Should the Office feel otherwise, Applicants hereby request an Examiner's interview to discuss this objection.

Parts 6-13 of the Office Action reject Claims 1-4 and 12-40 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

Claims 1, 3, 26, 29, 31, 32, 34, 36, 38 and 40 are being amended to provide sufficient antecedent basis and more distinctly point out the invention. Thus, Applicants believe these claims are now in condition for allowance under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. If any rejections are maintained or further rejections are raised, Applicants request an Examiner's Interview to try to handle them via Examiner's Amendment.

Part 14-19 of the Office Action reject Claims 26-28 and 32-40 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Reid (U.S. Patent No. 6,233,616).

Applicants believe a brief explanation of the present invention would be helpful. Fig. 1 represents an example embodiment in which an appliance alias 160 is depicted as a network device, but it represents any device having an external network address (e.g., IP address external from a subnet 180). The appliance alias 160 represents an appliance 110 in the subnet 180 posing as a device having an IP address external from the subnet 180 (see Specification, page 10, lines 9-13). In this way, the appliance alias 160 may be considered by nodes in the subnet 180 as being external from the subnet 180.

In contrast, Reid discloses an enterprise network management system having a first network node considered by nodes as internal to a local subnet. To further illustrate this point, Applicants point to Fig. 1 of Reid. Fig. 1 of Reid depicts a portable-computing device 101 that issues a DHCP request during initialization. Since a remote LAN 102 has no DHCP server, a router 108 is configured to service this request when it is received from portable computing device 101. Specifically, the router 108 is configured to forward the DHCP request from the portable computing device 101 to the DHCP server 120 on the other side of the WAN 110. This is accomplished by the router 108 transmitting the DHCP request across WAN 110 to the remote router 112 (Reid, col. 3, line 64- col. 4 line 7; Fig. 1). However, Reid does not describe or illustrate the portable computing device 101 as a node in the subnet considered by other nodes in the subnet to be external from the subnet. Instead, the portable computing device 101 is illustrated and described as just the opposite. That is, Reid discloses a network node that is internal to the local subnet and considered by other nodes in the subnet to be internal to the local subnet.

Accordingly, Reid does not anticipate every limitation of amended claim 26 (“... *the first network node considered by nodes in the local subnet as being external from the subnet* ...”). Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the rejection of claim 26 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) be withdrawn.

Independent claims 32, 34, and 38 include similar limitations and should be allowed for at least the same reasons as presented above. Because claims 27-31 depend from claim 26; claim 33 depends from claim 32; claims 35-37 depend from claim 34; and claims 39-40 depend from claim 38, these claims should be allowed for at least the same reasons.

### CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that all no pending claims (Claims 1-4 and 7-40) are in condition for allowance, and it is respectfully requested that the application be passed to issue. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this case, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH & REYNOLDS, P.C.

By Mark B. Solomon  
Mark B. Solomon  
Registration No. 44,348  
Telephone: (978) 341-0036  
Facsimile: (978) 341-0136

Concord, MA 01742-9133

Dated: 8/22/06